

[1st April 1930]

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) Rs. 44,436-15-7.

(c) Yes.

(d) The Government consider that no useful purpose would be served by placing the correspondence on the Council table as the Taluk Board has since agreed to refund the excess cess and the Government have sanctioned a loan to enable it to do so.

(e) No. The delay was due to the unwillingness of the Taluk Board to accept the debit and the protracted correspondence indulged in by that body.

Conduct of elections by the Koilkuntla Taluk Board.

* 1759 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Taluk Board of Koilkuntla, Kurnool district, fixed any date in the latter part of 1929, or even earlier, for the election of its Vice-President and members to the District Board and, if so, where the election meeting was to take place and when;

(b) whether the Government directed the postponement of the elections, and if so, why and when and the date of the communication of the order and the place to which the communication was addressed;

(c) whether the order of the Government directing the postponement of the election reached the President and the members after the elections had taken place and whether the President and the members were in any way responsible for the late receipt of the order by them;

(d) whether the President, District Board, duly reported to the Government the fact of the elections having taken place before the receipt of the order of the Government postponing the elections and solicited instructions as to whether the results of the elections might be communicated for the necessary publication by the Superintendent of the Government Press;

(e) whether the Government thereafter called for the explanations of the President, Taluk Board, Koilkuntla, and approved of the elections of the Vice-President of the Taluk Board and of other members to the District Board, and expressed the view that the results of the elections might be duly published and, if so, when;

(f) whether the President, District Board, Kurnool, sent the name of the elected Vice-President, Venkatalinga Reddi, for publication in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, and if so, whether any reminders were received by the Government and the Superintendent of the Government Press to expedite the publication of the name in the Gazette, and if so, on what dates and with what results;

(g) whether the results of the election of the Vice-President to the Taluk Board and of other members to the District Board have since been published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, and if so, when and if not, why not, and under what authority;

(h) whether the Government instructed at any time the Superintendent of the Government Press about the publication or non-publication or delaying the publication of the election results of the Taluk Board, and if so, how often, to what effect, on what dates, for what reasons and under what authority;

1st April 1930]

(i) whether the term of office as Taluk Board member of one of the members elected to the District Board—Gontimukkala Krishnayya of Owk—expired, while the publication of the fact of his election to the District Board was being delayed, and if so, when ; and

(j) how long it is now since the District Board of Kurnool has been without representation from the Taluk Board of Koilkuntla except for the ex officio representation by the President of the Taluk Board ?

A.—(a) Yes ; at Allagadda at 2 p.m., on the 5th October 1929.

(b) Yes ; on a representation from a member of the Taluk Board, Government ordered in a telegram, dated the 3rd October 1929, addressed to the President, Taluk Board, at Koilkuntla, the stay of the elections pending a report from the Collector of Kurnool in the matter.

(c) The President, Taluk Board, alleged that the telegram reached him on the 5th October 1929 after the elections were over. There was a strong suspicion however that the late delivery of the telegram was not accidental but Government did not pursue the matter.

(d) Yes.

(e) The President, Taluk Board's explanation was not called for. Government however declined to interfere with the elections already held and had no objection to the election notifications being published in the *Port St George Gazette*.

(f) Yes. No reminders were however received by Government in the matter. It is the President, District Board, who should arrange for the publication of the notification of the election of the Vice-President of the Taluk Board. The Superintendent, Government Press, reported to Government that the notification was received by him ; but as the matter was being investigated by the Collector, he was instructed to hold over its publication.

(g) Yes, in the *Port St. George Gazette* of the 25th March 1930.

(h) Yes. As the matter was being investigated by the Collector, the Superintendent, Government Press, was instructed on the 8th October 1929, the 5th December 1929 and the 15th January 1930 not to publish the notifications.

(i) & (j) Government have no information.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ If the Government had a strong suspicion that the late delivery of the telegram was not accidental, may I ask the hon. Minister why he did not take further action on the matter ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ Because, after an enquiry, we found that there was avoidance of receiving the telegram.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ At what place was the President of the Koilkuntla Taluk Board, when the telegram was sent ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ As far as I know the telegram itself was taken to Allagadda.”

[1st April.1930]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ May I know how then there was delay in taking delivery of the telegram ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ From what we have been able to gather the president avoided taking delivery of the telegram.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ May I know from the hon. the Minister, where the president was when the telegram was delivered ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ Notice, Sir.”

Religious and Charitable Endowments

Levy of fees on documents filed before the Hindu Religious Endowments Board.

* 1760 Q.—Diwan Bahadur R. N. AROGYASWAMI MUDALIYAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) the authority for applying the Court Fees Act to documents filed before the Hindu Religious Endowments Board ; and

(b) the authority empowering the Board to frame rules in 1925 and 1926 fixing court fees on documents filed before the Hindu Religious Endowments Board ?

A.—(a) Section 81 of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act, 1926 (Act II of 1927).

(b) No rules have been framed by the Hindu Religious Endowments Board in the matter. The fees in question were governed in 1925 and 1926 by section 77 of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act, 1923 (Act I of 1925), which corresponded to the section of the present Act, referred to in (a) above.

Alleged litigation concerning the Srikarpaganathar Swami temple.

* 1761 Q.—Mr. M. BALASUBRAHMANYA MUDALIYAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether Srikarpaganathar Swami temple at Karpaganatharkulam, Tiruturaipundi taluk, Tanjore district, was the subject of litigation before the Hindu Religious Endowments Board ;

(b) whether the Commissioner while interfering to set aside the order of the Temple Committee and while reinstating a dismissed trustee, directed the said trustee to deposit with the Board promissory notes and cash belonging to the temple ;

(c) whether while the matter was pending before the said Board, promissory notes in the custody of the Commissioner to the value of about Rs. 18,000 got time-barred ;

(d) whether any, and if so, what steps were taken to recover the said amount from the person or persons liable to make good the said loss ;

(e) whether the whole or any portion of the amount so lost was recovered ; and

(f) whether the Government propose to take any, and if so, what action in the matter ?

A.—(a) to (f) Information has been called for.